DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 074 SP 026 706

AUTHOR Stier, William F., Jr.
TITLE What Is Going on in Physical Education and Athletics in Junior and Community Colleges Today.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the National Convention of the American Alliance For Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (100th, Atlanta, GA, April 17-21, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Athletic Coaches; *Athletics; *Community Colleges; Higher Education; *Physical Education; Physical Education Facilities; *Physical Education Teachers; Program Administration; Program Design; *Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status

ABSTRACT

A national investigation was conducted in 1983 which sought to determine the status of physical education faculty in two year institutions of higher education. A survey instrument was developed and mailed to 300 randomly selected two year colleges within the United States. The mailing generated a usable response of 174 questionnaires. This report provides information on: (1) characteristics of the sample population; (2) curricular offerings in departments of physical education, health, and recreation; (3) faculty status (full or part-time, number of years of teaching experiences, male-female ratio); (4) degree status of department head or chairperson; (5) teaching and coaching experience; (6) departmental evaluation techniques; (7) faculty workload responsibilities; (8) tenure; (9) organizational structure of the physical education department; (10) rank order of physical activities offered by the department; (11) intramural activities; and (12) athletic facilities. Recommendations are made for further research. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263074

WHAT IS GOING ON IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS IN JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES TODAY

William F. Stier, Jr.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 026 706

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Stier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS IN JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES TODAY

Both junior colleges and community colleges have played a significant role in the education of the populace in this country. When one has considered college level physical education programs (both service programs and pre-professional programs) and the faculty staffing such programs, it is often the community and junior colleges which have been the last to come to mind. The role of the physical educator on the two year college level has similarly been neglected in terms of close examination in the professional literature. What were the circumstances within which the junior and/or community college physical educator has found himself/herself? What were the characteristics of physical educators who have comprised the physical education/coaching staff in the two year institutions of higher learning?

In an attempt to answer these and other related questions, a national investigation was conducted in 1983 which sought to determine the status of physical eduction faculty in such two year institutions of higher education. There have been few investigations on a national dimension into the quantitative status of physical education faculty n such colleges.

A survey instrument was developed and mailed to 300 randomly selected two year colleges within the United States. The mailing generated a usable response of 174 questionnaires for a 58% rate of return.

Sample Population

The sample population was arbitrarily limited to two year institutions of higher education (the first two years of undergraduate study) within the continental United States. The institutions surveyed consisted of 153 (90%) public schools. Those which were private but not religiously affiliated accounted for 7.69% of the population. Only a very small (2.36%) segment of the insti-

SP026706

tutions responding to the survey were private and religiously affiliated in nature. There was no significant difference between private non-sectarian and private sectarian institutions nor was there a significant difference between private institutions and public institutions.

Curricular Offerings

There was an average of 83 full time students pursuing a career within the department of Physical Education; Health and Physical Education; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; or some similar designation. Additionally, 30% of the institutions had between 26 and 50 full time students pursuing a career under the HPERD/A umbrella, while 16% of the schools had between 21 and 25 students doing the same. Finally, 86% of the schools had less than 5% of the total student population in the entire institution pursuing a career within HPERD/A.

In terms of specific career objectives, 70% of the students indicated an interest in involvement in athletic coaching; 80% indicated an interest in teaching health and/or physical education; 34% revealed that they were seeking recreation positions; 21% wanted positions in fitness programs while 20% sought a career in sports medicine/athletic training. Most of the students pursuing a career position under the HPERD/A umbrella expressed a willingness, indeed an interest, to explore more than just one specific avenue within the HPERD/A profession. Thus, students were seeking competencies in coaching, teaching, athletic training, etc., rather than in any one area. In terms of availability of terminal two year programs in HPERD/A and the availability of pre-professional programs, this investigation found that 22% of the institutions studied provided both two year terminal HPERD/A professional preparation

programs and two year pre-professional HPERD/A programs while 56% of the school provided only pre-professional programs within the profession.

Faculty Status

The average number of full and part-time members within the entire institution was 85 males and 58 females. The average number of staff members (full time and part-time) having some teaching responsibilities in the HPERD arena was 4.99 males and 2.64 females. Four out of ten institutions had total institutional enrollments within the range of 2000 to 7500 students. Thirty percent of the institutions had an enrollment range between 200 and 5000 students. The teaching ratio of full time departmental teaching staff to the number of full time students pursuing a program within HPERD was 10.3 to 1.

The years of experience coupled with degrees held of full time departmental staff members are summarized below.

FULL TIME PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS -- Highest Degree Held and Years of Total Teaching Experience

Experience	Bachelor's		Master's		Specialist's		Doctoral		Totals
	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Tea.
Under 2 Years	11	13	16	20	0	0	0	0	34
2-5 Years	13	22	28	32	0	0	1	1	55
Over 5 Years	37	104	143	634	13	18	42	53	809
	61	140	195	686	13	18	43	54	898

The largest number of full time staff members held the masters degree and possessed more than five years teaching experience credited to them. Full time faculty members with master's degrees accounted for 76.39% of the total population of full time physical education teachers while those professors holding the doctoral degree accounted for only 6.0% of full time teaching staff within HPERD.

In terms of the ratio between men and women teaching faculty within the entire institutions, 70% of the institutions had more men than women teachers

while only 13% of the schools had a majority of female faculty members. This ratio is similar when one looks into the department of HPERD where again 79% of the departments have more male teachers than female teachers and only 10% of the department had more female teachers than male teachers.

Chairperson Status

The highest degree held by the departmental chairperson was the master's degree (74% of the institutions) while the doctoral degree was a distant second (18.4%). The specialist degree (sixth year terminal degree) accounted for only 4.26% of the degrees held by the chief administrator of the department.

In a national study conducted in 1982 involving four year institutions of higher education, the highest degree held by the departmental chairperson was the doctoral degree (53% of the schools). The masters degree was a close second with 44% while the specialist degree accounted for a meager 1.46% of the degrees held by departmental chairperson. The population investigated in the 1982 study involved small colleges and universities (with undergraduate enrollments under 2501).

A significant number of chairpersons within the junior and community colleges (72%) had been at their present institutions for ten years or less. Only 2.19% had been at their present institutions for 21 years or longer while 18% had been in the same institution for 11-15 years and some 8% had been at the same site for 16-20 years.

In terms of the total number of years of teaching/administrative experience, the chairpersons tipped the scales at the other extreme with 51% having had 21 or more years of teaching/administrative experience at their present or other institutions. Only 3% had fewer than three years of total experience. Over

90% of the present chairpersons had 11 or more years of teaching and/or administrative experience in their career. The average length of time of the total teaching and/or administrative experience enjoyed by these chairpersons totaled twenty years. There seemed to have been greater mobility among chairpersons within the previous decade than was in evidence in the 1971 national study.

Teaching Experience/Coaching Experience

Teaching experience was revealed to be prior to appointment to the departmental teaching staff in 64% of the institutions while 36% indicated that their department would hire non-experienced staff members for teaching posts. A similar and significant percentage of respondents (60%) also revealed that coaching experience was a prerequisite for appointment to coaching/athletic type tasks. A further breakdown of the data revealed that 56% of the programs required both teaching and coaching experience prior to hiring, 28% required neither teaching nor coaching experience prior to initial appointment, 8% required coaching experience but not teaching experience and 8% required teaching but not coaching experience as a prerequisite for employment.

Coaches are required to teach as a matter of policy in 70% of the schools studied and individuals having dual coaching/teaching responsibilities are hired as coaches first in 21% of the institutions, hired as teachers first in 48% of the programs and hired as both teachers and coaches (equal emphasis) in only 31% of the schools. Staff members who functioned as both coaches and teachers have the right to earn tenure as teachers in 80% of the physical education departments. Additionally, a surprising 13% of the institutions revealed that individuals were able to earn tenure as coaches.

Evaluation Techniques

Evaluation techniques which were utilized within the HPERD departments for teaching competency centered principally around four distinct methods. The four methods of faculty evaluation and the percentage of institutions which utilized the techniques were: Self-Evaluation (51.5%), Student-Evaluation (87%), Administrative-Evaluation (82%) and Peer-Evaluation (31%). The chart below illustrates the types of evaluation techniques which were utilized singly or incombination with one another within the HPERD arena.

Evaluation Techniques Utilized Within HPERD Departments for Faculty

# of Depts.	%	Types of Evaluation Techniques: Self-E.	%	Stu.-E.	%	Admin.-E.	%	Peer-E.	%
2	1.21	Yes	2.35	Yes	1.38			Yes	3.93
28	16.96	Yes	32.94	Yes	19.44	Yes	20.59	Yes	54.90
8	4.85	Yes	9.42	Yes	5.55				
38	23.04			Yes	26.38	Yes	27.94		
41	24.85	Yes	48.23	Yes	28.48	Yes	30.15		
9	5.45			Yes	6.26	Yes	6.62	Yes	17.65
9	5.45					Yes	6.62		
12	7.72			Yes	8.34				
5	3.03	Yes	5.88			Yes	3.67		11.76
6	3.64					Yes	4.41	Yes	11.76
6	3.64			Yes	4.17			Yes	
1	.61	Yes	1.18						
		85	100%	144	100%	136	100%	51	100%
		(51.51%)		(87.27%)		(82.42%)		(30.91%)	

It is interesting to note that 25% of the administrators indicated that Self-Evaluation coupled with Administrative-Evaluation and Student-Evaluation accounted for the greatest single "system" of faculty evaluation. The second most evident "system" involved only Student-Evaluation and Administrative-Evaluation (23%). Ranked in the third position was the process whereby all four types of evaluation were utilized (17%) to determine competency in the classroom.

In terms of evaluation techniques utilized for coaches, almost half (48%) of the responding institutions revealed that the "system" for evaluation of coaches involved only the administrators' evaluation. The second most prevalent "system" ended in a tie (9.38%) between no evaluation at all for coaches and a combination of Self-Evaluation and Administrative-Evaluation. Only slightly less than 2% of the institutions indicated that the win/loss record of an individual coach is utilized in determining competency (officially, at least).

Workload Responsibilities

The duties assigned to full time physical educators usually involved more than merely teaching as a significant part of their workload. In fact, only 9% of the responding institutions had staff members who had only teaching responsibilities. Also, only 25% of the faculty members have had teaching as their only major responsibility. A majority of the staff members (69%) in 59% of the institutions were involved in teaching and coaching or were involved in teaching and administration or in teaching, coaching and administration. Only 1.28% of the full time staff members were involved exclusively in coaching tasks.

It was noteworthy to see that the priority of two out of every five administrators rested primarily on the coaching competency when hiring new staff while only 1% of all such full time staff members in the schools surveyed were exclusively involved in coaching tasks during 1982-83. This fact coupled with the knowledge that 70% of the schools surveyed had as an institutional or departmental policy the requirement that full time staff members in athletics should be required to teach as well as coach, pointed to the inconsistency with which individuals were being selected and subsequently assigned duties within the physical education and athletic department(s).

The tenure question continued to be a very important and timely subject on many college campuses -- both four year and two year institutions. The vast majority (80%) of the responding two year colleges indicated that coaches who also teach may earn tenure as teachers. This would be in keeping with the institutions' policies and practices of requiring (athletic) staff members to do more than merely coach, i.e., to be involved in the teaching process within the academic community of the institution, whether in one of the HPER & A disciplines or other academic pursuits.

In respect to competency expectations for coaches in the win/loss column, a preponderance of schools (95%) failed to have any official policy or criteria in respect to such expectations for "winning and losing" in athletic sports. The fact that only 5% of the colleges had adequately addressed this all important area of concern and had developed such a policy or statement suggests a presumption that the criteria for success in the athletic arena would not significantly or exclusively hinge upon the winning or losing record of an individual coach. However, past evidence, even within the spectrum of the junior colleges and community colleges, would tend to caution against complete acceptance of such a presumption.

Part-time physical education staff members are often involved in coaching duties exclusively. In fact, 38% of the institutions (accounting for 30% of the part-time staff) have individuals involved exclusively in coaching duties. Only a small percentage (17%) of part-time staff members (involving 23% of the schools) are involved in teaching and coaching or in the areas of teaching and administration or in teaching, coaching and administration.

Many administrators cited the management or organization of the athletic and physical education department(s) to be of significant importance to the success of the overall athletic and physical education programs. An examination into the department of physical education (or similar designation such as HPERD) in respect to the athletic arena revealed that athletics and physical education are treated as a combined entity in 56% of the institutions while in 44% of the schools the athletic arena is kept separate from the academic world of physical education.

The actual organizational and administrative structures of the physical education and athletic department(s) of the 151 institutions which responded to the question on organizational structure are outlined below. The key elements or issues revolve around three factors. First, whether the position of athletic director and the position of chairperson are combined or kept separate. Second, whether the athletic director and the chairperson report to different individual(s) or to the same individual(s). And thirdly, whether the athletic director and chairperson report as equals or as unequals to whomever they report.

Organizational Structure

An examination into the departments' administrative structure revealed that athletics and physical education were treated as a combined entity in 56% of the institutions while in 44% of the programs the athletic arena was kept separate from the academic world of physical education.

The actual organizational and administrative structures of the physical education departments of the 151 institutions which responded to the question on organizational structure are outlined below.

Reporting Structure of Administrators

Institutions	%	Adminstrative Structure
9	5.96	Athletic Director reports to Chairperson
7	4.64	Chairperson reports to Athletic Director
42	27.81	AD and Chair report to same Superior(s) as equals
55	36.42	AD and Chair report to different Superior(s) as equals
9	5.96	AD and Chair report to same Superior not as equals
28	18.54	AD and Chair report to different Superiors not as equals
1	.67	Other
151	100.00	

The key elements or issues -- insofar as organizational structure was concerned -- revolved around three factors. First, whether the position of Athletic Diretor and the position of Chairperson were combined or kept separate. Second, whether the Athletic Director and the Chairperson reported to different individuals or the same individual(s). And thirdly, whether the Athletic Director and Chairperson report as equals or as unequals to whomever they report.

In viewing the chart above it becomes evident that in 55% of the institutions studied the Athletic Director and the Chairperson reported to different individuals. The Athletic Director and Chairperson reported to the same individual(s) in 34% of the schools. Both administrators reported on an equal basis in 64% of the programs and on an unequal basis in 25% of the programs studied.

A vast majority of the physical education programs and athletic programs had secretarial assistance (90%). Some 70% of the administrators had exclusive use of the available secretarial help while 30% had to share the secretarial staff with another department or program.

Of those institutions which had access to secretarial assistance, 35% merely utilized student help, 24% had professional assistance, while 41% made use of both student and professional secretarial personnel. Of the administrators responding to this inquiry, 59% indicated that the secretarial assistance/service provided by the junior/community college was indeed adequate.

The same percentage of departments of physical education had developed policies and procedures handbooks (45%) as did the athletic departments within the institutions surveyed (however, some institutions had one and not the other while some institutions had both types of handbooks). The fact that over 50% of the schools surveyed failed to have a current athletic handbook or written policies, procedures and practices could be indicative of a lack of advanced planning and sophistication at this level. A similar statement could be made concerning the physical education departments.

Title IX has been credited (and/or cursed) with having significant impact/effect upon the physical education and athletic programs of this country's educational institutions. However, only 28% of the respondents in this national investigation felt that Title IX had such an effect upon their particular program(s) at their institutions.

With the majority of the athletic administrators feeling no significant impact from Title IX, two questions warrant being posed. First, were these programs already in compliance with the act prior to its enactment? Second, are these athletic programs currently in compliance with Title IX and its most recent interpretations?

A question similar to that asked concerning Title IX was posed to the administrators regarding the impact of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Discounting the small minority of administrators who were not even aware of Section 504 (5%), 76% felt that this law has had no significant effect upon the physical education or the athletic programs within their institutions. Only a very small segment (20%) acknowledged that Section 504 had created a significant impact upon their programs. The administrators, when asked to reveal whether or not their institution and/or programs were currently in compliance with Title IX, indicated that the athletic programs were in compliance in 92% of the institutions and not in current compliance in 8% of the schools. One of the comments provided by a department administrator centered around the theme that a department is in compliance until the government declares it is not in compliance. Such an attitude would seem hard to justify in today's responsible athletic management/administration.

A significant percentage (28%) of the physical education departments had no institutional requirement for service classes. Of those schools requiring physical education service classes, a one year requirement was revealed in 43% of the programs while 29% had a two year requirement. Only 13% of the total population did not even provide service classes.

The activity class requirement was cited as having been changed within the past ten years within 48% of all responding schools. In fact, 29% had had the requirement changed within the previous five years. Of those programs which had a change in the time requirement of the service classes within the previous ten years, a large number (69%) of the chairpersons indicated that the change had been one of decreasing the number of years which were required

of students in the service program. Nineteen percent of the schools indicated that there has been an increase in the requirement while 12% indicated some other type of changes took place.

The top twenty physical activities included within the service programs are provided below in rank order.

Rank	Service/Activity Classes
1	Tennis
2	Volleyball
3	Golf
4	Basketball
5	Badminton
6	Softball
7	Beginning Swimming
8	Bowling
9	Soccer
10	Racquetball
11	Gymnastics
12	Modern Dance
13	Advance Swimming
14	Fitness
15	Slimnastics
16	Fold Dance
17	Square Dance
18	Lifesaving
19	Tumbling
20	Football

However, if the activities associated with aquatics were combined into one category; if gymnastics and tumbling were considered as one general category; and, if all dance activities were classified into one group, the top sixteen physical activities in terms of the service program would include:

Rank	Service/Activity Service
1	Aquatics
2	Dance
3	Tennis
4	Gymnastic/Tumbling
5	Golf
6	Basketball
7	Badminton
8	Softball
9	Bowling
10	Soccer
11	Racquetball
12	Fitness
13	Slimnastics
14	Football
15	Track and Field
16	Karate

A majority of service programs had classes graded (85%) while such grades were counted on the students' cumulative GPA. The second (7%) most prevalent method of grading such classes was on the S/U basis. Being graded but not

being counted on the cumulative GPA was the situation existing in only 5% of the programs while less than 1% of the programs did not grade service classes in any manner whatsoever.

The most common frequency of class meetings was twice per week (93%). Three days per week for service classes was available in 32% of the schools. Classes were scheduled for the traditional fifty minutes in 42% of the programs. However, there was a significant trend (available in 42% of the schools) to offer classes for longer time blocks than the traditional fifty minutes.

Adaptive service classes were provided for the general student body in 45% of the schools. Substitutions were acceptable for service classes in 62% of the programs. Substitutions such as athletic participation (32%), veteran status (34%) and age (18%) were the three most commonly accepted substitutions. The average age which would allow a student to be excused from service classes was 23.06 years with the range being from 20 years of age to 30 years.

Cuts were allowed in 70% of the service programs. Students were required to drop a service class following excessive absences in 71% of the programs. Students who had missed service classes were allowed to make up absences in 80% of the programs. Various methods of make-up techniques were utilized including special make-up classes (39%) and attendance at other service classes (71%). Students were allowed to test out of service classes by demonstrating competency in 19% of the service class programs investigated.

Absences affect grades (in those service programs in which grades were awarded) in 77% of the programs. Criteria for grades ranged widely with the following criteria being utilized most frequently: knowledge tests (96%), atendance (93%), skill tests (91%), fitness (31%), proper attire (18%), attitude (2%).

The top twenty intramural activities -- in terms of frequency and availability to the student bodies in the various institutions -- are listed below. The list reveals that basketball, volleyball, tennis and softball were the four most popular activities in 1982-83.

Rank	% of Institutions	Specific Activity
1	70.7	Basketball
2	53.4	Volleyball
3	50.0	Tennis
4	46.5	Softball
5	38.5	Ping Pong
6	37.3	Football
7	28.7	Badminton
8	25.3	Billiards
9	24.1	Bowling
10	23.6	Golf
11	22.4	Racquetball
12	18.4 tie	Soccer (tie)
12	18.4 tie	Cross County (tie)
14	17.2	Archery
15	12.1	Track and Field
16	9.2	Swimming
17	7.7	Water Polo
18	5.2	Baseball
19	4.6	Handball
20	2.3	Wrestling

Out of the 174 responding institutions, 159 (91%) indicated that an active intramural program was in evidence on their campus.

Chairpersons of physical education departments were asked about the role of major students in physical education within the intramural programs in terms of actual participation and officiating in IM contests. It was revealed that 92% of the schools surveyed did not require either major or minor students in physical education to participate in intramural activities while 85% do not require such students to act as officials for IM contests.

A close examination of general participation (men and women) in IM activities revealed that there is significantly greater numbers of male students exhibiting a higher rate of IM participation than their female counterparts. In response to a question concerning the average percentage of participation in IM activities on the college campus for men and women students, 16% of the administrators cited the average male participation on their campuses to be at or about the 50% rate. However, only 6% of these same administrators cited the average female participation in the IM program to be at or above the 50% rate.

The individuals given prime responsibility for organization, administration and supervision of the IM program are designated HPER/IM staff members in 81% of the schools studied. However, only 3% of the institutions had a student appointed to this position of high responsibility. Over 72% of the colleges had a bonafied faculty member or college administrator actually present for all IM activities and competition.

The time factor set aside for the various IM activities and the selection of officials for competition were two vital cogs in any IM program. The most popular time for intramurals were in the evenings on weekdays (97%), weekday afternoons (61%), and weekday mornings (21%). Only 3.38% utilized weekends for activities.

Officials were selected through a vareity of means. Volunteers from the general student body were used by 45% of the schools while IM participants were themselves required to officiate in the programs in 18% of the institutions. Physical education administrators required students pursuing a major or minor in physical education to officiate (as a part of an official departmental policy) in 15% of the institutions studied. Almost half (45%) of the schools paid officials for their service -- whether these officials were student, staff or faculty.

The practice of giving awards for IM achievements was in evidence in 96% of the programs. Procurement of awards was through the department of HPER or IM in 68% of the programs. Interesting enough, 8% of the programs required participants themselves to pay for the funding of the awards system. Finally, slightly over 24% of the IM administrators utilized a variety of other means (besides participant and department monies) to finance the IM awards program.

A survey of the facilities available to the athletic and physical education and intramural programs revealed twenty-four most frequently accessible participation facilities. A ranking of these facilities is provided below along with the number of schools possessing the specific areas.

Facilities Available for Intramural Activities/Recreation Activities/Athletic Activities/Service Class Activities

Facility	Rank	# Of Institutions	%	# Of Campus	%	# Off Campus
Weight Room (tie)	1	156	96.25	154	1.25	2
Tennis Courts (tie)	1	156	83.75	134	13.75	22
Field House (tie)	3	154	93.75	150	2.50	4
Gymnasium (tie)	3	154	90.62	145	5.63	9
Softball Fields	5	140	73.73	118	13.75	22
Other Facilities (tie)	6	119	58.75	113	3.75	6
Baseball Field (tie)	6	119	58.75	94	15.63	25
Training Room	8	118	73.75	118	0.00	0
Soccer Field	9	115	65.65	105	6.25	10
Handball Court	10	105	36.88	59	28.75	46
Golf Course	11	92	8.13	13	49.38	79
Dance Room	12	82	50.63	81	.63	1
Bowling Alley	13	81	3.75	6	46.88	75
Games Room	14	64	40.00	64	0.00	0
Football Field	15	63	40.63	49	8.75	14
Wrestling Room	16	61	38.13	61	0.00	0
Gymnastics Room	17	56	33.75	54	1.25	2
Outdoor Tack	18	52	28.13	45	4.38	7
Natatorium	19	48	25.63	41	4.38	7
Indoor Track	20	40	20.00	32	5.00	8
Sauna	21	35	11.88	19	3.75	6
Steam Room	22	16	13.13	21	3.75	6
Ice Hockey	23	14	.63	1	8.13	13
Squash Court	24	11	4.38	7	2.50	4

The average seating capacity of the available field houses was 1547 with the range of seating capacities below a low of 200 and a high of 4000.

In response to the question whether the available facilities during the 1982-83 academic year were adequate to meet the needs of the students and the IM programs, fifty-nine percent of the responding administrators indicated that -- in their estimation -- the available facilities were indeed adequate, both in terms of programmatic needs and student needs.

While 91.4% of the schools taking part in this investigation have a planned IM program, less than half (42%) provide for any type of extramural program. A similar percentage (44%) do provide for club sport participation with more club sports being organized through student services (49%) or through student government (26%) than through any other single vehicle. Only 17% of the club sport programs were administered or funded through the athletic department/program. Additionally, 4% of the institutions were administered and 20% were funded through the IM department/program. A variety of other means for administering (9%) and funding (14%) club sports were identified within the sample population.

Conclusions

Physical educators on the junior college and community college level are, generally speaking, highly educated and experienced. However, there has not been a significant growthinthe level of education achieved by chairpersons of physical education (holding the doctoral degree) during the past decade.

There has been a trend within the past decade to allow coaches to earn tenure both as teachers and as coaches although the number of institutions allowing the latter is still relatively small. There is also atrend towards requiring full time teachers as well as full time staff members who coach to have had previous experience in similar endeavors prior to being hired on the two year college level. Yet, there is a significant number of institutions which do not require previous experience in teaching and/or coaching.

The professional staff member at the two year college level continued to fill the role of the generalist rather than the specialist in terms of his/her areas of responsibility within HPERD/A.

There is a serious discrepancy in the area of evaluation of coaches on the two year college level. Institutions, administrators and staff members must come to grips with the evaluation of coaches in a systematic process which protects both the individual being evaluated and the institution itself. The fact that less than 2% of the institutions officially recognize the fact that win/loss records are taken into account in the evaluatin of coaches would seem to be inconsistent with the established practice on the firing line of athletics at this institutional level.

The organizational structure of the academic HPERD department and the athletic program varied throughout the population lending support to the physical education and athletic entities.

Great efforts are being made within the junior and community colleges to establish and maintain close articulation links between the two year institutions and the four year undergraduate institutions to which a majority of the junior/community college graduates (those interested in pursuing further studies within the HPERD/A arena) must transfer in order to comlete the four year degree program.

There has been a significant increase within the past decade in the number of junior/community college students expressing interest in such career positions as athletic training/sports medicine, fitness programs and in recreation. There continues to be high interest (in terms of career goals) in the more traditional HPERD/A career choices of teaching physical education, teaching health education and in coaching athletic activities.

It is essential that two year colleges continue to meet the needs of their students in the area of terminal one and two year programs within HPERD/A as well as in the pre-professional curricular programs (which necessitates a transfer to a four year college or university for degree completion).

Further investigation and research is warranted and recommended by this researcher in the following specific areas:

1. Tenure -- the criteria for granting tenure to coaches who also teach on the junior and community college leve.
2. Guidelines -- the establishment of concrete guidelines and policies regarding criteria for competency expectation in the win/loss column for coaches.
3. Priorities -- the hiring priorities of staff members on the junior and community college scene in both coaching and teaching tasks.
4. Hiring Criteria -- examination into responsibilities assigned in light of criteria utilized in the selection and hiring of coaches who also teach.
5. Title IX and Section 504 -- the impact of these two laws on the HPERD & A arena and the current status of the HPERD program in light of the acts' rules, regulations and interpretations.
6. Evaluation -- programs, policies and procedures, teachers, administrators and coaches.

Dr. William F. Stier, Jr.
Chairperson/Professor: Physical Education and Sport
Athletic Director
State University of New York
Brockport, New York 14420